

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Remarks**

Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10 and 12 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10 and 12, and canceled claims 5, 6, 13 and 14. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance based on the discussion which follows.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, it was alleged that the drawings do not show the claimed axial bore provided with a stop, as recited in previously presented claim 1 with respect to Figure 6, and the end for releasably holding the tool having “a stop,” recited in previously presented claim 9 with respect to Figure 5. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 to remove the aforementioned recitation of the “stop,” thereby rendering the objection to the drawings now moot.

Claims 9, 13 and 14 were objected to for including informalities. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 9 and canceled claims 13 and 14, rendering the objections now moot.

Claims 9, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by WO 84/04367 (WO ‘367), or, alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious in view of WO ‘367. Claims 1-7, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elsner (U.S. Patent No. 5,156,480) in view of WO ‘367.

As an initial point, Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment After Final should be entered, as it does not raise any new issues requiring consideration. Upon entry of this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter previously recited and, therefore, previously examined and fully considered in claim 6 (which includes the subject

matter of intervening claim 5). Since the subject matter of claim 1 (currently amended) has already been examined, the amendment to claim 1 does not raise any new issues for consideration.

Similarly, with respect to claim 9, by this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 9 to now include the subject matter previously recited in claims 5 and 6. Since the subject matter of claims 1 and 9 are similar, i.e. a hydromechanical chuck and a mandrel, respectively, the amendment to claim 9, to include the subject matter of claims 5 and 6, only requires a cursory review and no undue burden to examine. Therefore, the amendment to claim 9 should be entered in the Amendment After Final.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 (currently amended) and claim 9 (currently amended) are not anticipated by or obvious in view of WO '367, individually or in combination with Elsner. The present invention, as now recited in claim 1 (currently amended) and claim 9 (currently amended), is directed to a hydromechanical chuck (claim 1) or a hydromechanical mandrel (claim 9) having a sealing means arranged between a piston and an outer sleeve with the sealing means arranged closer to the pressurized side of the piston than to a relief side, as was previously recited in claims 5 and 6. Claim 1 and claim 9 (currently amended) recite subject matter in terms of a sealing means which is not taught or in any way made obvious from the prior art of record. The use of the claimed sealing means has the advantage that shunting of hydraulic fluid between the ends of the piston can be avoided, in particular, in situations where the outer sleeve is relatively thin. In such cases, the pressure from the outer sleeve acting on the outer side of the piston can be so low that shunting of hydraulic fluid from one pressure chamber to the other might occur, which in turn has the result that mounting/dismantling cannot be carried out.

Although WO '367 mentions the use of a sealing means, WO '367 does not mention arrangement of the sealing means closer to the pressurization side of the piston than to the relief side. Accordingly, WO '367 fails to anticipate the claimed sealing means. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to alter the location of the sealing means in WO '367 to result in the claimed location, as doing so provides unexpected benefits not known from the prior art. Arranging the sealing means as in the amended claims has the effect that the friction between the piston and the outer housing is higher during mounting than during dismantling, since a shorter part of the piston can be lubricated by the hydraulic medium along the outer sleeve. This, in turn, has the advantage that a dismantling pressure lower than the mounting pressure can be used, with the following advantage that there is no risk that the necessary dismantling pressure is higher than the pressure that is available, which otherwise might be the case when a dismantling pressure equal to or higher than the mounting pressure is needed.

Applicant further respectfully submits that the present claimed device is novel over the previously cited art of U.S. Patent No. 3,208,759 ('759) and German Patent DE 3,502,362, which were cited in connection with sealing means.

The '759 patent discloses a clamping device having one end for mounting in a machining device and another end for releasably holding a shaft tool. However, as has been explained in the Amendment filed December 28, 2006, in response to the Office Action dated August 5, 2006, '759 discloses a completely different solution, as compared to the present invention. Although '759 discloses a sealing means 46 that is arranged further to a pressurization side of the piston 15, this is in a completely different device, which fails to have the structure or function of the claimed device. Further, there is nothing mentioned in '759 as to why the sealing ring is positioned where it is positioned and, therefore, the '759 patent provides absolutely no incentive

for a person skilled in the art to apply the positioning of a sealing means in '759 in an arrangement according to the present invention. From the '759 patent, there fails to be any reasonably apparent reason why one would include a sealing means in a hydromechanical chuck or mandrel, in the location as now claimed. This is even further emphasized by the description and claims of '759, since only pressurized air is mentioned as a medium for operating the device of '759. When using air, the positioning of the sealing means has no effect on the friction between the piston and the outer housing and, therefore, the advantage of the present invention is not obtained. Consequently, the positioning of the sealing means in '759 cannot be considered as anything other than coincidental and, therefore, there is nothing guiding a person skilled in the art towards the particular positioning, according to the present invention, in order to obtain the advantages of the present invention.

Like the '759 patent, DE 3502362 discloses a clamping device having an end for mounting in a machining device and another end for releasably holding a shaft tool. However, as also has been explained in the Amendment of December 28, 2006, DE 3502362, too, discloses a completely different solution, as compared to the present invention.

Further, DE 3502362 discloses a sealing means 15 arranged between the piston 3 and the outer housing 1. This sealing means, however, is arranged exactly in the middle between the pressurization side 10 and the relief side (the chamber to which the channel 18 leads). Therefore, DE 3502362 does not in any way disclose an arrangement of a sealing means, according to the present invention.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach or in any way make obvious the claimed hydromechanical chuck or mandrel.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

**END REMARKS**